

REMARKS

The Office Action dated August 7, 2007, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments and the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1-13 have been rejected. Claims 1, 2, and 4 have been amended, new claim 14 has been added, and claim 3 was previously cancelled. Thus, claims 1, 2 and 4-14 are pending in this application. Support for the amendments may be found in the specification and claims as originally filed. In particular, support for the amendments to claim 1 may be found in the specification at page 27, line 24 to page 28, line 3 and Fig. 12. New claim 14 has been added which recites that "the narrower portions have substantially arc-shaped outlines along outlines of the first electrodes." Support for this feature may be found in the specification at page 28, lines 2-3. As claim 14 is dependent on claim 1, it includes all the limitations of claim 1. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 14 is allowable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed below.

The Applicants respectfully submit that no new subject matter has been added and request reconsideration and withdrawal of all objections and rejections.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 8, 9 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by DeConde et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,889,565, hereinafter "DeConde"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a pressure sensor, wherein “the first wires have larger width portions in spaces between adjacent sensor sections and narrower width portions in the vicinities of the sensor sections, and the narrower portions have outlines that are at a substantially constant spacing from outlines of the respective sensor sections.” As discussed in the specification, this feature permits the sensor sections to be arranged closer together, thus achieving higher packing density. It also increases the area over which the sensor sections receive pressure. Thus, advantageously, it is possible to achieve sensitive pressure detection.

As admitted by the Examiner, DeConde fails to teach the first wires having larger width portions in respective spaces between adjacent sensor sections, wherein the first wires are connected to the first electrodes at the larger width portions. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that DeConde does not anticipate independent claim 1, and claims 8, 9 and 11-13, which depend therefrom.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 8, 9 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over DeConde.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over DeConde as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ganapathi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,578,436 B1, hereinafter “Ganapathi”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As stated above, primary reference DeConde fails to teach all the features of claim 1, as amended. Further, secondary reference Ganapathi fails to cure DeConde's defects. In particular, nowhere does Ganapathi teach or suggest that "the first wires have larger width portions in spaces between adjacent sensor sections and narrower width portions in the vicinities of the sensor sections, and the narrower portions have outlines that are at a substantially constant spacing from outlines of the respective sensor sections," as recited in claim 1.

Rather, referring to Fig. 4, Ganapathi merely teaches forming vias 40 in wider parts of row leads 20 and column leads 30. Ganapathi teaches nothing about the leads having narrower portions that have outlines that are at a substantially constant spacing from outlines of the respective sensor sections, as recited in claim 1, as amended. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and claims 2 and 4, which depend therefrom, are not obvious over the proposed combination of DeConde and Ganapathi.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over DeConde in view of Ganapathi.

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over DeConde as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Tamori (U.S. Patent No. 5,526,701, hereinafter "Tamori"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As stated above, primary reference DeConde fails to teach or suggest all the features of claim 1, as amended. Secondary reference Tamori fails to cure the defects

of DeConde. Since neither primary reference DeConde nor secondary reference Tamori teach or suggest “the first wires have larger width portions in spaces between adjacent sensor sections and narrower width portions in the vicinities of the sensor sections, and the narrower portions have outlines that are at a substantially constant spacing from outlines of the respective sensor sections,” as recited in claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 5 and 6 are not obvious over the proposed combination of DeConde and Tamori.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over DeConde in view of Tamori.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over DeConde as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Jarvis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,539,554, hereinafter “Jarvis”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As stated above, primary reference DeConde fails to teach or suggest all the features of claim 1, as amended. Secondary reference Jarvis fails to cure the defects of DeConde. Since neither primary reference DeConde nor secondary reference Jarvis teach or suggest “the first wires have larger width portions in spaces between adjacent sensor sections and narrower width portions in the vicinities of the sensor sections, and the narrower portions have outlines that are at a substantially constant spacing from outlines of the respective sensor sections,” as recited in claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7 is not obvious over the proposed combination of DeConde and Jarvis.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over DeConde in view of Jarvis.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over DeConde as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of McClure (U.S. Patent No. 5,898,235, hereinafter "McClure"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As stated above, primary reference DeConde fails to teach or suggest all the features of claim 1, as amended. Secondary reference McClure fails to cure the defects of DeConde. Since neither primary reference DeConde nor secondary reference McClure teach or suggest "the first wires have larger width portions in spaces between adjacent sensor sections and narrower width portions in the vicinities of the sensor sections, and the narrower portions have outlines that are at a substantially constant spacing from outlines of the respective sensor sections," as recited in claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 is not obvious over the proposed combination of DeConde and McClure.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over DeConde in view of McClure.

CONCLUSION

The Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below to schedule a personal or telephone interview to discuss any remaining issues.

In the event that this paper is not being timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account Number 01-2300, referencing Docket Number 103213-00099.

Respectfully submitted,



Sushupta T. Sudarshan
Registration Number 60,021

Customer Number 004372
ARENT FOX LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: 202-857-6000
Fax: 202-638-4810

STS:vmh

Enclosure: Abstract (clean copy)